

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AND DEVELOPMENT

P.O. Box 1947
Sacramento, CA 95812-1947
(916) 576-7109
(916) 263-1406 (FAX)
(916) 263-1402 (TDD)



July 26, 2011

To: CSBG Contractors

From: Leslie Taylor, Manager
Program Development and Technical Support

Subject: 2010 Community Services Block Grant Information System (CSBG/IS) Survey

CSD would like to express our gratitude to CSBG Eligible Entities for participating in the 2010 CSBG/IS Survey.

Accompanying this letter is the completed 2010 California Community Services Block Grant Information System (CSBG/IS) Survey which was submitted to the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCS) on March 30, 2011. The aggregated information was reported in the 2010 National CSBG/IS Statistical Report prepared by NASCS. The national report was then forwarded to OCS and Congress to illustrate the impact and outcomes of the CSBG Network and its programs throughout the United States.

This report is different from the reports issued prior to 2009 as it contains information on CSBG ARRA funding. The survey includes the items listed below for CSBG and CSBG ARRA:

Part I

- Section A – State Allocations of FY 2010 CSBG Funds
- Section B – General Information on the California CSBG Network and Distribution of Funds
- Section C – General Information on State CSBG Administration
- Section D – Program and Management Accomplishments (CSD 090)
- Section E – CSBG Expenditures by Service Category & Demographics (CSD 425.OF)
- Section F – Other Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network (CSD 425.OR)
- Section G – Client Characteristic (CSD 295/903)

Part II

- Outcomes of Efforts – National Performance Indicators (CSD 801/901)

Attachments

- Attachment A – List of Eligible Entities

July 26, 2011
2010 CSBG/IS
Page 2

The CSBG/IS contains valuable information regarding the accomplishments of the CSBG Network in 2010. CSD encourages each agency to utilize the data in local reports to promote the value of the CSBG Programs.

Should you have any questions concerning this report, please contact Leslie Taylor at (916) 576-7192.

Enclosures

Section A

State Allocations of FY 2010 CSBG Funds

California

Section A: State Use of CSBG Funds

1. State Reporting Period (month/day/year)

From: 01/01/10 To: 12/31/10

Total CSBG funds expended in FY 2010 for:

	Planned	Actual	ARRA Planned	ARRA Actual
a. Eligible Entities	\$55,837,140	\$55,837,140	\$71,907,760	\$70,989,998
b. State Administrative Costs *	\$3,102,063	\$3,102,063	\$891,500	\$888,143
* ARRA ONLY: Report Planned and Actual Funds spent on Benefits Enrollment Coordination Activities				
c. Discretionary Projects	\$4,903,580	\$3,438,418		
d. Total Funds	\$63,842,783	\$62,377,621	\$72,799,260	\$71,878,141

3. Of the total in 2d, how much represents carryover funding from the previous fiscal year?

\$1,801,516

4. Carry-forward of FY 2010 funds to FY 2011 programs

\$1,465,161

\$0

5. State CSBG funds (see instructions)

\$0

TOTAL CSBG funds expended by State in FY 2010

\$62,377,621

\$71,878,141

Section B

General Information on the California CSBG Network & Distribution of Funds

1. Eligible entities receiving FY 2010 funds:

(Please attach the provided Excel Spreadsheet for eligible entities, their addresses, and their award amounts.)

a. Number of Community Action Agencies (CAAs) among eligible entities	53
b. Number of Limited Purpose Agencies (LPAs) among eligible entities	2
c. Number of organizations serving migrant or seasonal farmworkers	4
d. Number of these also counted in a or b	1
e. Number of tribal organizations	3
f. Number of these also counted in a, b, or c	0
g. Number of units of local government	24
h. Number of these also counted in a, b, c, or e	24
i. Others designated by statute	0
j. Number of these also counted in a, b, c, e, or g	0
k. Total unduplicated number of eligible entities	61

2. Were previously funded eligible entities dropped in FY 2010?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Number: 1

Reason: Community Action Agency of San Mateo filed bankruptcy and CSD dedesignated the agency.

3. State allocation method:

- ☐ Historic ☐ Hold Harmless + Formula
☐ Formula with variables ☐ Other (please specify)
☒ Base + Formula
☐ Formula Alone

4. Coverage of counties

a. Percent of State's counties receiving CSBG services at year end from local CSBG operators:	99%
b. Number of counties newly receiving CSBG services in FY 2010 (if any)	0

c. Name of newly served county(ies) in FY 2010:

Uses of Discretionary Project Funds
(if listed in Section A, Item 2.c)

a. What types of organizations received the awards?

1. Indian Tribes or tribal organizations	\$100,000
2. Migrant or farmworker organizations	\$0
3. State subgrantee associations	\$2,905,657
4. Eligible Entities	\$0
5. Other (please specify below):	\$432,761

Limited Purpose Agencies (LPA's)

Section A
Discretionary

Total Discretionary Funds Expended	\$3,438,418	\$3,438,418
------------------------------------	-------------	-------------

b. For what purposes were the awards given?

1. Awards to local agencies for expansion to new areas	\$233,584
2. Grants for exemplary or demonstration programs	\$0
3. Competitive grants for exemplary or demonstration programs	\$0
4. Training or technical assistance for local agencies	\$415,501
5. Statewide programs	\$0
6. General Support	\$2,356,572
7. Other (please specify below):	\$432,761

Limited Purpose Agencies (LPA's)

Section A
Discretionary

Total Discretionary Funds Expended	\$3,438,418	\$3,438,418
------------------------------------	-------------	-------------

The totals of a. and b. should match both each other and Item 2.c in Section A.

Section C

General Information on State CSBG Administration

1. Please identify the cabinet or administrative department of your State CSBG office.

- ☒ Community Services Department
 ☐ Governor's Office
☐ Human Services Department
 ☐ Community Affairs Department
☐ Social Services Department
 ☐ Other (please specify)

2. What is the division, bureau, or office of the CSBG Administrator?

California Department of Community Services and Development

3. Other programs directed by the CSBG Administrator in FY 2010

a. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct DOE Weatherization?

☒ Yes ☐ No

b. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct part or all of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) bill payment and/or crisis assistance programs?

☒ Yes ☐ No

1) If yes, does the CSBG Administrator also direct the LIHEAP energy conservation program?

☒ Yes ☐ No

c. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct USDA programs? If yes, please list titles below:

☐ Yes ☒ No

d. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct HUD programs? If yes, please list titles below:

☒ Yes ☐ No

Lead Hazard Control Grant

e. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct any other federal programs for the homeless?

☐ Yes ☒ No

f. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct State Head Start programs?

☐ Yes ☒ No

g. How many federal or State programs not listed above are also directed by the CSBG Administrator? (List titles of other programs below)

4. Was the State CSBG office subject to a reorganization in FY 2010, such as an expansion or contraction of programs, or a transfer of the CSBG office to a different division or department?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please describe the change (attach an extra page if necessary):

5. State statute regarding CSBG:

a. Does your State have a statute authorizing Community Service programs? (If yes, please attach) ☒ Yes ☐ No

b. Did your State legislature enact authorizing legislation, or amendments to an existing authorizing statute during FY 2010? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Please check those items which describe provisions of the current statute.

1) What is the termination date of the current statute?

2) Does it "grandfather" CAAs? ☒ Yes ☐ No

3) Does it specify the terms, or formula, for allotting 90% pass-through funds among eligible entities? ☒ Yes ☐ No

4) Does it require local grantees to match CSBG funds? ☐ Yes ☒ No

5) Does it provide for the designation of new eligible entities? ☒ Yes ☐ No

6) Does it provide for the de-designation of eligible entities? ☒ Yes ☐ No

7) Does it specify a process the State CSBG agency must follow to re-designate an existing eligible entity? ☒ Yes ☐ No

8) Does it designate the bureau, division, or office in State government that is to be the State administering agency? ☒ Yes ☐ No

9) If it has other provisions, please list them:

.. Did it cost more in FY 2010 than the federally allowed limit in your State's CSBG allocation for your State to effectively administer the range of services and activities required by the CSBG Act? ☐ Yes ☒ No

b. If yes, what was the amount of these extra costs?

c. If yes, were State funds used to supplement federal administrative expenditures? ☐ Yes ☒ No

d. If yes, what was the amount of the supplemental State funds?

7. a. How many State positions were funded in whole or in part by CSBG funds?

b. How many Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds?

Section D

Program and Management Accomplishments

Please do NOT use acronyms.

See instructions for further details.

1. Strategic Thinking for Long-Term Solutions

- a. Please describe an agency strategy which addresses a long-term solution to a persistent problem affecting members of the low-income community.

Agency Name: **Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County**

- i. How did the agency identify the community need?

Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County (CAPSBC) has implemented a long-term approach to serving low-income clients that extends back for decades. This process tracked how the majority of clients seeking assistance were determined to be repeat clients. It became clear through CAPSBC's strategic planning process and client feedback that there was a need for programs to address more than just emergency basic needs. At this point, the Family Development Program (FDP) revised its program strategy and began implementing programs where clients could achieve long-term outcomes and self-sufficiency.

- ii. How were CSBG funds used to plan, manage, and/or develop the approach?

CAPSBC used CSBG funds to hire Family Development Specialists, or case managers, to assist clients in attaining goals to achieve self-sufficiency. CSBG funds also were used to research and apply for other grant opportunities to implement programs that would result in long-term outcomes. A program that was created in 2003 to improve client outcomes was the Individual Development Accounts (IDA) Program. Another program was the Obershaw House Transitional Housing Program.

- iii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Local partners that are involved with CAPSBC include: the Workforce Development Department, which helps clients in developing job skills; the Inland Empire Women's Business Center, which provides entrepreneurship classes for clients; Springboard, which provides financial education classes; NeighborWorks, which provides home ownership classes; Union Bank, which provides matching funds and serves as a holding bank for IDA accounts; and many others.

- iv. What outcome indicators did the agency use to measure success?

Outcome indicators used to measure the success of clients include: 1.1 – Employment; 1.2 – Employment Supports; and 1.3 – Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization. When clients obtain jobs, purchase homes, earn GEDs, open small businesses, maintain household budgets, open savings accounts, and other goals such as these, we know that we have strong, tangible outcomes indicating that the program is working.

- v. What outcomes have resulted in FY 2010? If no outcomes yet, when?

CAPSBC has achieved outcomes in the areas of employment, education; home ownership, and small business start-up. In 2010, CAPSBC had a total of 24 successful graduates of its Individual Development Accounts (IDA) program.

- Nine IDA graduates used their assets to pursue post-secondary education at various colleges such as California State College at San Bernardino; Fullerton State College; Beeson Seminary in Alabama; Victor Valley College; and others.
- Twelve IDA graduates purchased homes in San Bernardino, Fontana, Rialto, Chino Hills,

and Beaumont. The combined value of these homes was more than \$1.7 million dollars.

- Three IDA graduates started or expanded small businesses. Some of those businesses were: a computer business; a cosmetics business; and an on-line video production.

Also in 2010, two residents of CAPSBC's transitional housing program, Obershaw House, received their GEDs, making them more marketable for employment. One resident also completed a Medical Assistant course at American Career College, went on to complete an externship, and was then hired by a doctor's office.

These outcomes show how CAPSBC was able to provide resources to eliminate barriers, helping clients become self-sufficient. CAPSBC could not have done it alone. Rather, it took community partners who were willing to invest time, funding, and other resources. It also took clients who were willing to change their lives by investing time and commitment.

2. Delivering High-Quality, Accessible, and Well-Managed Services

- a. Please describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during FY 2010. Show how responsible, informed leadership led to effective and efficient management of the CSBG program.

Top State Management Accomplishment:

The Department of Community Services and Development, Community Services Division (CSDiv) performed an in-depth review of the current standards and determined that one of its goals is to ensure that its staff and the Network of Agencies are trained and knowledgeable regarding monitoring practices and programmatic reporting. CSDiv invested in training staff and the CSBG eligible entities on the National Performance Indicators. To further enhance CSDiv staff's knowledge, they attended state monitoring training. Both training sessions were conducted by the National Association of Community Services Programs (NASPCSP). With new staff and a new manager, this investment in training was very important to increase the quality of service to the Network and enhance the knowledge and understanding of the administration of the CSBG program.

In 2010, the CSDiv successfully administered the CSBG American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds with minimal staff and a high level of accountability and transparency requirements. The ARRA requirements did not allow the State to retain any funds for administrative costs. The program was administered effectively and efficiently by management and staff, who were informed of the program goals and outcomes, specific reporting requirements, and best practices. The current 3 field monitors conducted 42 full on-site reviews for CSBG and CSBG ARRA in an unprecedented timeframe. As a result of the hard work of the state staff and the timely communication with the CSBG eligible entities, California was able to expend 98.8% of the CSBG ARRA funds.

The CSBG ARRA mandated states to reserve one percent of the funds to be used for "benefits enrollment coordination activities". Twenty-one CSBG eligible entities were allocated these funds through a competitive bid process to expand or implement the federal Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) program to increase the utilization of the federal program for low income families and individuals. More than 28,000 low-income families were served and 4,229 of the clients served used a free tax preparation service and applied for EITC for the first time.

In addition to managing the CSBG and CSBG ARRA funds, the CSDiv experienced three separate on-site monitoring visits by State and federal entities, including the Office of Community Services, State Controller's Office, and the Bureau of State Audits.

- b. Please describe what you consider to be the top three management accomplishments achieved by your agencies during FY 2010. Show how responsible, informed leadership and effective, efficient processes led to high-quality, accessible, and well-managed services.

Top Three Agency Management Accomplishments:

Agency Name:

Accomplishment:

•Strategic Planning: Eligible entities developed strategic plans to guide their boards and staff on improving communication, program development and evaluation, goal setting, and marketing strategies.

Agency Name:

Accomplishment:

•New or Expanded Programs: Eligible entities identified unmet needs in their service areas and either implemented new or expanded program delivery services such as homeless prevention, marketing and outreach, energy, and employment services

Agency Name:

Accomplishment:

•Improving Organization Capacity: To improve and/or increase efficiency, eligible entities invested resources to implement more efficient strategies of improving: program services; communication; hiring criteria for new staff to ensure the most knowledgeable and skilled are selected; and the use of technology for better data collection.

3. Mobilizing Resources to Support Innovative Solutions

- a. Please describe how your agency addressed a cause or condition of poverty in the community using an innovative or creative approach. Showcase how your agency relied on mobilization and coordination of resources to help reach interim and final outcomes. Demonstrate how CSBG "works" as it funds staff activities, investments, or services to meet a community need.

i. Agency Name: Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission

ii. Program Name: School of Unlimited Learning

iii. CSBG Service Category: Education, Support Services

iv. Description of program (capacity, duration, targeted population, etc)

The School of Unlimited Learning (SOUL) presently serves, educates, and works with over 250 high risk students each year, ranging from ninth through twelfth grade, ages 14 through 21. The targeted youth have not yet received high school diplomas, and reside primarily within the metropolitan area of Fresno. Most have histories of low academic achievement and are not currently benefiting from available support services in the traditional school system, or are in need of more comprehensive social services. Nearly 100% of SOUL students are socio-economically disadvantaged, have a history of truancy, and possess reading and math skills at significantly below grade level.

SOUL's educational program includes both classroom-based and non classroom-based (independent study) programs. Students enrolled in the independent study program have scheduling conflicts with a traditional school day due primarily to health issues (both physical and mental), childcare concerns, or employment needs. Each student is assigned a

case manager to assist in resolving family, social, and community needs beyond the educational requirements.

v. How was the agency's approach innovative or creative? Please be specific.

SOUL was conceived as a response to the high number of dropouts from Fresno's traditional secondary schools. An alternative educational program was needed to provide students at risk of dropping out an opportunity to stay in school and earn their high school diplomas. SOUL's individualized approach, coupled with services such as case management, mental health counseling, child development education, and a childcare facility, has attracted many students who would have otherwise dropped out of school because such services were not available to them. Such supportive services are virtually non-existent on a traditional comprehensive high school campus. Because of SOUL, students who did not have an alternative to the traditional high school can now fulfill their academic requirements by receiving supportive services which have proven to be vital to these students' success

vi. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

Each year, over 40 students graduate from SOUL. Without SOUL, these students would have dropped out of school. For most students, SOUL is their last chance to earn high school diplomas. Thanks to the supplemental supportive services provided by CSBG funding, SOUL has experienced a continuous increase in student performance on State exams, assisted a record number of students to pursue their educations at the post-secondary level, and kept many students, including pregnant and parenting teens, from dropping out of school. SOUL students, who were formerly 80% truant at their former schools, now enjoy an average daily attendance of nearly 90%.

vii. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

CSBG funds were used primarily to fund the following services:

- A child development/life skills teacher to work primarily, but not exclusively, with pregnant and parenting teens to help them become responsible parents and committed students in order to earn their high school diplomas;
- A career counselor to provide support and outreach to students who are preparing for post-secondary educational opportunities after graduation;
- Bus tokens for students who have no other means of transportation to and from school;
- Case managers to provide individualized personal counseling and referrals to community resources for students who are experiencing severe problems which serve as obstacles to their academic success;
- A truancy prevention officer to conduct home visits and meet with parents and students, and at times transport students to school, to help students remove barriers to attending school.

viii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Local partners who support the efforts SOUL to work with high risk students to assist them in removing barriers to academic success are the following:

- Kaiser Mental Health provides mental health counseling to students.
- California State University, Fresno, provides graduate social work interns who offer counseling to students and their families.
- Fresno City College provides transition services for students about to graduate from high school to enable them to prepare for college. In addition, current SOUL students are able to earn college credits while still enrolled in high school through the Fresno City College Enrichment Program.
- Fresno Cultural Arts Rotary has donated musical equipment to SOUL's music program to support at risk students to become more engaged in school by providing them access to

music and the performing arts.

- Fresno County Office of Education provides leadership training and teambuilding through the Dare to Dream Program.

- Fresno County EOC Employment and Training provides paid work experience for Workforce Investment Act eligible students.

- Fresno County EOC Human Resources Department assists students with work experience placements, and provides workshops for students regarding "success in the workplace" in conjunction with SOUL's careers class.

- Early Head Start- provides free childcare for all SOUL teen parents.

- Fresno County EOC Health Services provides basic health care, and such services as sports physicals.

- Adolescent Family Life Program provides individualized and case management services for eligible pregnant and teen parents, including counselors for teen fathers.

- Women, Infants, and Children Program (WIC) provides resources, such as healthy foods, infant formula, nutrition education, and referral services to teen parents.

- Fresno Local Conservation Corps- provides transition services to students wishing to transfer to the Fresno Local Conservation Corps or Youth Build program.

Please do NOT use acronyms.

See instructions for further details.

4. Providing Positive Results for Vulnerable Populations

- a. Please describe one youth-focused initiative that illustrates how CSBG funding was used and coordinated with other programs and resources.

Agency Name: Community Action Partnership of Kern

i. Description of initiative

Community Action Partnership of Kern's Shafter Youth Center provides after-school activities to community youth ages 6 to 18. Recognizing the importance of providing community youth with a safe and stimulating place to gather during after-school hours, experienced staff engage program youth in fun and exciting activities that are geared toward increasing confidence, elevating educational attainment, and encouraging success. The Shafter Youth Center after school program provides a welcoming environment for community youth where they feel safe and participate in daily activities such as: homework assistance; tutoring; arts & crafts; a reading program; hands-on computer lab activities; a Wii Stay Fit fitness program; and recreational activities such as basketball, volleyball, dodge-ball, hockey, flag football, jump rope, and softball.

Services such as the After School Homework Program, provide young people with the critical support necessary to help them meet the basic proficiency standards in reading and math. The goal is to keep youth engaged in learning through the tutoring and homework assistance services as well as develop good habits, such as completing homework and studying before participating in leisurely activities.

Through the Wii Stay Fit program and the various recreational games and activities the agency is combating childhood obesity by encouraging young people to move and be active.

The After-School program is provided Monday through Friday from 1:30-5:00pm, which is stated by the National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center as being the peak time for juvenile crime and risky behaviors. In an effort to ensure that all youth have access to the after-school program, transportation is available from the local school sites to the Shafter Youth Center. Daily snacks are also provided. The After-School Program and all of its services are provided at no cost to program participants.

ii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Kern County Superintendent of Schools provides trained and experienced tutors to the Community Action Partnership of Kern's Shafter Youth Center After-School Program, addressing the community's need for supplemental educational services in math and language arts for kindergarten to 8th grade students.

Kern County Food Bank provides snacks to the After-School Program participants through the Kern County Food Bank Snack Attack Program. Alleviating the hunger of the participants allows youth to focus on their homework and tutoring services and enjoy the recreational activities, without having to fight hunger pains until they arrive home.

Shafter Police Activity League fights juvenile delinquency by providing a free boxing program to community youth ages 8-18 years, during the Community Action Partnership of Kern's After-School Program. The program focuses on teaching youth boxing techniques as well as discipline and leadership skills.

University of California and 4-H Youth Program provides weekly sessions that utilize hands-on activities and lesson plans designed to teach leadership, citizenship, and life skills needed to empower youth to

reach their full potential. The sessions are presented to both youth groups and teen groups. Interactive games and activities are used to tackle topics such as: problem solving, communication, money fundamentals, social skills, and preferred learning styles. Upon completion of the program, participants are expected to participate in a community service project and a citizenship project, both of which are designed to get the youth active within the community and to provide them with opportunities to create positive impacts.

Community Volunteer Program provides community youth with an opportunity to give back to their communities, while at the same time gaining valuable work experience by volunteering to assist with the Shafter Youth Center After School Program and/or Summer Program. Through this community service, these community youth are able to explore career possibilities, earn high school credit, and satisfy college application requirements. Community volunteers assist with homework, recreational activities, and daily operations such as set-up and clean-up.

Workforce Investment Act Program (WIA) - Through the Kern High School District Career Resource Department, high school students assist with the Shafter Youth Center's Summer Program. The students assist with signing the youth in and out of the center, monitoring the youth and in leading recreational activities, for which they are compensated for through the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) program. Assisting at the Shafter Youth Center is a first job for many of the youth participating in the program and serves as a training center where they can gain work experience and learn good work habits.

iii. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

From January to December 2010, there were 310 youth enrolled in the After-School/Summer Program, thereby reducing the number of unsupervised youth in the community during peak times for juvenile crime and risky behaviors. During the same time period, 123 families utilized the program's free After School/Summer Program so that the parents could obtain and/or maintain employment.

During 2010, volunteers contributed 2,315 volunteer hours to the After School Program. The Kern County Food Bank Snack Attack Program donated 2,398 lbs of food to the center to serve as snacks for the After School Program participants.

iv. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

The Community Action Partnership of Kern Division Director for Family, Youth and Community Services provides oversight for all of the programs implemented at the Shafter Youth Center, including the After-School/Summer Program. The Division Director's time is funded by CSBG funding and she is responsible for program planning, supervision of administrative staff, program and asset development, report writing, and fiscal and general coordination of all program projects.

b. Please describe one senior-focused initiative that illustrates how CSBG funding was used and coordinated with other programs and resources.

Agency Name: Community Services and Employment Training, Incorporation

i. Description of initiative

Community Services & Employment Training, Inc. (CSET) has expanded services to seniors by 100%. The renewal of our contract to manage three Employment Connection One Stop Centers in Visalia, Tulare, and Porterville provided CSET access to more seniors who are seeking assistance with job, placement, energy and housing, home repair and weatherization services.

ii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Tulare County Workforce Investment Board contracts with CSET to manage three Employment Connection Centers, providing CSET access to this population. This access allows CSET to holistically serve seniors by providing services specific to this population's needs. Senior Employment programs are available that are specifically set aside for individuals 55 years and older. Seniors also have access to

training opportunities to help them reenter the job market, including computer training, interviewing training, and resume updating and creation. Seniors also have access to emergency services like home and rent assistance, energy and gas payments, and home repair.

iii. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

In 2010, 781 seniors were served through Employment One Stops. Additionally, 253 seniors received services from CSET that allowed them to continue to live independently in non-institutionalized settings. CSET services included senior home repairs, energy assistance, housing and employment services.

iv. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

CSBG funds were used to write the proposals for gaining competitive grants for senior programs and for CSET staff to gain training and knowledge for better serving seniors. CSBG funding also allows CSET to coordinate services for seniors across CSET programs and to refer seniors to other community resources.

Please do NOT use acronyms.

See instructions for further details.

5. Impact of ARRA CSBG Funds

- a. Please describe how one agency program, funded at least in part by ARRA CSBG funds, created or saved jobs in your community.

Agency Name:

i. Number of jobs created and/or saved:

ii. How were ARRA CSBG funds used? Please be specific

The ECM meets with unemployed job seekers to aid them in writing resumes, searching for employment, referring them to other resources, and paying for job-related needs.

The ECM also worked one day a week at the Humboldt County multi-agency supported Job Market doing job counseling and referral. She trained and certified as a Job Seeker Services Professional and obtained certification to facilitate Winning the Employment Game, a 2 week career development and job search training program.

She met with 218 clients and aided them in writing resumes, searching for employment, referring them to other resources, and paying for job related needs (interview clothes, bus passes, resume paper, flash drives (to save completed resumes and take with them), job training, driver's license costs, etc). 14 of those clients obtained work prior to Oct. 1 and at least another 12 obtained jobs in the last quarter of 2010 after being counseled by her (others may have found jobs, but have not reported that back to her).

The Case Manager also assisted in job placement of 18-21 year-old youth, other RCAA programs' clients, renters of affordable housing units, and for new income-eligible County residents who are reached through RCAA's outreach and information campaign or other sources of referral. The CSBG ARRA Program Coordinator working in the RCAA Fiscal Division worked 20% on support of this project to create maximum community coordination and benefit among ARRA programs and assist in meeting the compliance requirements of the Recovery Act contract.

iii. If applicable, how were regularly appropriated CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

Two Redwood Community Action Agency (RCAA) Senior Planners funded through regular CSBG 2010 funds were highly involved in supervising the day-to-day operation of this program and other CSBG ARRA programs. Other regular CSBG 2010-funded staff assisted in the program to some degree, including the RCAA Human Resources Director, Executive Director, Chief Financial Officer, and Information Technology Specialist.

iv. What percent of participants had incomes in the following ranges when they enrolled in the program?

1. 0% to 125% of Federal Poverty Line (FPL) 2. 126% to 200% of FPL

v. Describe the community improvement created or supported using ARRA CSBG funds.

1. The role of partners or collaborations

The partnership with The Job Market was extensive. The case manager worked at The Job Market one day a week, received training there, and made and received referrals to and from there.

2. Type of resource contributed by each partner (monetary, in-kind, services, etc)

RCAA Clients received interview clothes and shoes from the Rescue Mission. Other interview clothes were purchased using gift cards at a local Ross store.

At the Humboldt County Access and Resource Center (for people with physical disabilities), the employment Case Manager aided in counseling disabled individuals and was able to obtain clothing and orthotics for work-related purposes.

Frederick and Charles Beauty College donated haircuts to RCAA clients.

Both the United Way Community Switchboard and the Arcata Endeavor, a homelessness service provider, routinely referred clients to the ECM.

- vi. Had the need addressed by this initiative been identified in previous community assessments or was it an emergent problem?

The need had been identified earlier, but it became an emergent problem caused by the sudden increase in layoffs and unemployment rates in Humboldt County. For instance, from March of 2008 to March of 2009, the number of unemployed people in Humboldt County increased by 72.1% from 4,300 people to 7,400 people, and the unemployment rate jumped from 7.0% to 12.0% in the same period. At the time that CSBG ARRA funds became available, the unemployment rate was still well above 11%. Also, for both foreclosure prevention and rental eviction prevention, it became evident that if a homeowner or renter was unemployed, they were going to have a difficult time getting a mortgage modified or a rental eviction rescinded.

- b. Please describe one major agency initiative supported at least in part by ARRA CSBG funds (other than the initiative listed in "5.a", above).

Agency Name: Redwood Community Action Agency

- i. Was this a new initiative or the expansion of a previously offered program/service?

This was a new initiative that had never been offered before.

- ii. Which factor(s) allowed for the creation or expansion of these services? (Check all that apply)

☒ Increased Funding

☐ Operational changes

☒ Expanded income eligibility

☐ Other (please explain)

Please explain other:

An estimated 3.0% of the regular CSBG 2010 allocation to RCAA was used, which is \$7,857. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

This was used for a portion of the program supervisors' time (Senior Planners), plus a smaller portion of the Information Technology Specialist, Human Resources, Fiscal staff, and the Executive Director time.

- iii. Regarding regularly appropriated CSBG funds:

1. How much CSBG was used to support this initiative?

\$67,400

2. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

The amount of ARRA CSBG funds was \$53,000 to pay for the full time Housing & Financial Counselor's salary, benefits, and operating expenses, such as space costs, phones, computer, equipment, office supplies, etc. Another \$14,400 was used to pay 20% of a CSBG ARRA Program Coordinator's salary and benefits, as well as the operating expenses at the RCAA Fiscal Division to support this project and to create maximum community coordination and benefit among ARRA programs and assist in meeting the compliance requirements of the Recovery Act contract.

iv. Regarding ARRA CSBG funds:

1. How much ARRA CSBG was used to support this initiative? \$67,400

2. How were ARRA CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

The amount of ARRA CSBG funds was \$53,000 to pay for the full time Housing & Financial Counselor's salary, benefits, and operating expenses, such as space costs, phones, computer, equipment, office supplies, etc. Another \$14,400 was used to pay 20% of a CSBG ARRA Program Coordinator's salary and benefits, as well as the operating expenses at the RCAA Fiscal Division to support this project and to create maximum community coordination and benefit among ARRA programs and assist in meeting the compliance requirements of the Recovery Act contract.

v. Did this initiative primarily impact (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Infants and children (0-11 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. Seniors (55+ years) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Youth (12-18 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5. Entire Community |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Adults (18-54 years) | |

Please explain if this affected the entire community:

True

vi. What percent of participants had incomes in the following ranges when they enrolled in the program?

1. 0% to 125% of Federal Poverty Line (FPL) 29 2. 126% to 200% of FPL 38

vii. Describe the community improvement created or supported using ARRA CSBG funds.

1. The role of partners or collaborations

Partners included Consumer Credit Counseling Service of the North Coast, who went in together on a joint workshop on successful homeownership and financial literacy; the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program which referred households in danger of rental eviction who needed financial literacy education.

An additional partnership was established with RMK Realty, who provided referrals to homeowners in jeopardy of foreclosure. The Housing and Financial Counselor was a guest speaker at the College of the Redwoods and taught the fundamental of finance and responsible credit usage to incoming freshman students.

2. Type of resource contributed by each partner (monetary, in-kind, services, etc.)

Most of the services provided were in-kind.

viii. Had the need addressed by this initiative been identified in previous community assessments or was it an emergent problem?

It had been identified as a useful program to have, but it was really an emergent program. With the spike in the unemployment rate in Humboldt County from 2008 to 2010 from 7% to over 11%, there were many more people unable to continue making mortgage and rent payments. An estimated 558 homeowners would receive a default notice on their mortgages in 2010.

Over 50 homeowners had their homes saved from foreclosure as a result of receiving housing counseling services by the Housing & Financial Counselor.

As a result of the Housing & Financial Counseling program, in calendar year 2010, the following CSBG NPI goals were reached: NPI 1.3.3 c & e. – the aggregated dollar amount of funds accumulated to purchase a home was \$210,731. The aggregated dollar value of loans refinanced or modified, forbearances, and credit card rate reduction was \$221,651. NPI 2.2 E. – 21 households increased or preserved the quality of life in their neighborhoods, since foreclosed homes become a blight to a neighborhood. NPI 3.2 C. – 19 low income people purchased their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance; NPI 4.1 A-K. Expanded opportunities through community-wide

partnerships were accomplished by expanding resources with two nonprofits, one faith-based organization, three local governments, three for-profit companies, one school district and four financial institutions. NPI 6.1 A & B – 22 seniors were served – 11 with a disability. NP 6.2 C. – 42 households received emergency rent or mortgage assistance. Other HUD-required outcomes: 26 households completing financial literacy education, including home financing, budgeting or credit repair; 5 households received long term pre-purchase counseling; 10 households brought their mortgages current (no longer in default); one household had their mortgage refinanced; 13 had their loans modified; 3 entered into forbearance agreements; 2 households sold their homes; 2 households were foreclosed; 2 households were counseled and referred to social services agencies; and 17 received foreclosure prevention budget counseling.

Narrative Stories

#1 Case Example for the RCAA Housing & Financial Counseling Program

The following example illustrates how a Counselor prevented foreclosure and kept homeowners from losing their homes. She helped a client negotiate with Wells Fargo Bank to reduce a monthly mortgage payment from \$1,610/month to \$1,095/month (including taxes and mortgage insurance) with the first five years at only 2% interest. The total income saved over the life of the 15 year loan will be \$85,057.91 and the client avoided foreclosure.

The following example illustrates another kind of financial assistance where the Counselor helped with debt restructuring. The client had amassed a \$70,000 credit card debt, so the Counselor called Chase Bank and negotiated her client's credit card interest rates down from 15.24% to 8% and 11.24% to 8% as a hardship case. The amount of discretionary income available to her client for food, medicine, transportation, and other necessary expenses before assistance was only \$374/month. The amount of income available to her for these expenses after negotiation with Chase Bank was \$601/month.

The Counselor also helped the client pay off her credit card debt completely. The interest rate for her client's mortgage was 9.95% with a monthly loan payment of \$961 and a principal balance of \$65,000. The client was approved for a 4.875% cash-out refinance, so her new principal balance is \$135,000 with a monthly loan payment \$1,075.32 for 15 years. Although her monthly loan payment increased by \$114/month, it was used to pay off \$1,645/month in minimum monthly payments to her credit cards. The amount of income available for her client after refinance is \$2,075/month. This compares with the \$374/month available to her before contacting the RCAA Housing & Financial Counselor. Her new annual discretionary income is \$24,900 and her old annual discretionary income was \$4,488. The significance of this \$20,000 annual increase in the client's financial situation can hardly be imagined.

#2 Employment Support Case Example

Toward the end of June 2010, it became apparent that two employees working for Eureka City Schools Adult Education in the resource room of The Job Market in Eureka were going to be laid off. After meetings between RCAA Senior Planner Kari Love and County Employment Training Division Director Connie Lorenzo, Redwood Community Action Agency negotiated to pay the wages of these two employees until CSBG ARRA funding ended at the end of September. The employees were paid \$15.00 per hour. Thus, these two individuals had two more months of pay. Moreover, RCAA collaborated with both Eureka City Schools Adult Education and Humboldt County multi-agency supported Job Market. Also, because of this CSBG ARRA funding, the Job Market's Resource Room was enabled to be open for approximately 64 more hours than it would have been, allowing many job seekers more access to computers for resumes, cover letters, and job searches. This was an emergent problem brought on by layoffs and high unemployment.

ix. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

It had been identified as a useful program to have, but it was really an emergent program. With the spike in the unemployment rate in Humboldt County from 2008 to 2010 from 7% to over 11%, there were many more people unable to continue making mortgage and rent payments. An estimated 558 homeowners would receive a default notice on their mortgages in 2010.

Over 50 homeowners had their homes saved from foreclosure as a result of receiving housing counseling services by the Housing & Financial Counselor.

As a result of the Housing & Financial Counseling program, in calendar year 2010, the following CSBG NPI goals were reached: NPI 1.3.3 c & e. – the aggregated dollar amount of funds accumulated to purchase a home was \$210,731. The aggregated dollar value of loans refinanced or modified, forbearances, and credit card rate reduction was \$221,651. NPI 2.2 E. – 21 households increased or preserved the quality of life in their neighborhoods, since foreclosed homes become a blight to a neighborhood. NPI 3.2 C. – 19 low income people purchased their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance; NPI 4.1 A-K. Expanded opportunities through community-wide partnerships were accomplished by expanding resources with two nonprofits, one faith-based organization, three local governments, three for-profit companies, one school district and four financial institutions. NPI 6.1 A & B – 22 seniors were served – 11 with a disability. NP 6.2 C. – 42 households received emergency rent or mortgage assistance. Other HUD-required outcomes: 26 households completing financial literacy education, including home financing, budgeting or credit repair; 5 households received long term pre-purchase counseling; 10 households brought their mortgages current (no longer in default); one household had their mortgage refinanced; 13 had their loans modified; 3 entered into forbearance agreements; 2 households sold their homes; 2 households were foreclosed; 2 households were counseled and referred to social services agencies; and 17 received foreclosure prevention budget counseling.

Narrative Stories

#1 Case Example for the RCAA Housing & Financial Counseling Program

The following example illustrates how a Counselor prevented foreclosure and kept homeowners from losing their homes. She helped a client negotiate with Wells Fargo Bank to reduce a monthly mortgage payment from \$1,610/month to \$1,095/month (including taxes and mortgage insurance) with the first five years at only 2% interest. The total income saved over the life of the 15 year loan will be \$85,057.91 and the client avoided foreclosure.

The following example illustrates another kind of financial assistance where the Counselor helped with debt restructuring. The client had amassed a \$70,000 credit card debt, so the Counselor called Chase Bank and negotiated her client's credit card interest rates down from 15.24% to 8% and 11.24% to 8% as a hardship case. The amount of discretionary income available to her client for food, medicine, transportation, and other necessary expenses before assistance was only \$374/month. The amount of income available to her for these expenses after negotiation with Chase Bank was \$601/month.

The Counselor also helped the client pay off her credit card debt completely. The interest rate for her client's mortgage was 9.95% with a monthly loan payment of \$961 and a principal balance of \$65,000. The client was approved for a 4.875% cash-out refinance, so her new principal balance is \$135,000 with a monthly loan payment \$1,075.32 for 15 years. Although her monthly loan payment increased by \$114/month, it was used to pay off \$1,645/month in minimum monthly payments to her credit cards. The amount of income available for her client after refinance is \$2,075/month. This compares with the \$374/month available to her before contacting the RCAA Housing & Financial Counselor. Her new annual discretionary income is \$24,900 and her old annual discretionary income was \$4,488. The significance of this \$20,000 annual increase in the client's financial situation can hardly be imagined.

#2 Employment Support Case Example

Toward the end of June 2010, it became apparent that two employees working for Eureka City Schools Adult Education in the resource room of The Job Market in Eureka were going to be laid off. After meetings between RCAA Senior Planner Kari Love and County Employment Training Division Director Connie Lorenzo, Redwood Community Action Agency negotiated to pay the wages of these two employees until CSBG ARRA funding ended at the end of September. The employees were paid \$15.00 per hour. Thus, these two individuals had two more months of pay. Moreover, RCAA collaborated with both Eureka City Schools Adult Education and Humboldt County multi-agency supported Job Market. Also, because of this CSBG ARRA funding, the Job Market's Resource Room was enabled to be open for approximately 64 more hours than it would have been, allowing many job seekers more access to computers for resumes, cover letters, and job searches. This was an emergent problem brought on by layoffs and high unemployment.

Section E

CSBG Expenditures by Service Category & Demographics

Statewide Aggregated Data

Number of Agencies Reporting: 61

Table 1: Total amount of CSBG funds expended in FY 2010 by Service Category

Service Category	CSBG Funds	CSBG ARRA Funds
Employment	\$9,750,509	\$38,706,194
Education	\$9,071,403	\$3,014,808
IncomeManagement	\$2,084,533	\$2,748,659
Housing	\$2,915,897	\$3,625,569
EmergencyServices	\$9,584,844	\$5,048,340
Nutrition	\$5,242,949	\$2,212,570
Linkages	\$3,666,573	\$2,566,299
SelfSufficiency	\$7,206,971	\$5,380,168
Health	\$1,885,371	\$1,845,187
Other	\$6,379,318	\$15,488,913
Totals	\$57,788,368	\$80,636,707

Of the CSBG funds reported above	\$16,070,811	\$4,713,074	were for administration.
	27.81%	5.84%	

Please consult the instructions regarding what constitutes "administration."

Table 2: Of the funding listed in Table 1: Funds for Services by Demographic Category, FY 2010

Demographic Category	CSBG Funds	CSBG ARRA Funds
Youth (Aged 12-18)	\$6,920,640	\$3,029,864
Seniors (Aged 55+)	\$4,585,082	\$2,838,787

Section F

Other Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network

Statewide Aggregated Data

Number of Agencies Reporting: 61

Subsection III. Local Resources

a. Amount of unrestricted funds appropriated by local government	\$46,348,903
b. Amount of restricted funds appropriated by local government	\$26,039,162
c. Value of Contract Services	\$9,883,630
d. Value of in-kind goods/services received from local government	\$1,575,872

TOTAL: LOCAL PUBLIC RESOURCES

\$83,847,567

If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection
I or II, please estimate the amount

\$380,583

Subsection IV. Private Sector Resources

a. Funds from foundations, corps., United Way, other nonprofits	\$13,549,258
b. Other donated funds	\$8,776,400
c. Value of other donated items, food, clothing, furniture, etc.	\$32,134,370
d. Value of in-kind services received from businesses	\$5,917,657
e. Payments by clients for services	\$11,090,935
f. Payments by private entities for goods or services for low- income clients or communities	\$21,724,525

TOTAL: PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES

\$93,193,145

If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection
I, II, or III, please estimate the amount

\$0

TOTAL: ALL OTHER RESOURCES
(FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, PRIVATE)
less amount of double count in Subsection II, III, IV

\$1,559,305,917

ARRA ONLY

\$169,626,196

California

Section F: Other Resources Administered and Generated

Number of Agencies Reporting: 61

Subsection I. Federal Resources

Amount of FY 2010 CSBG allocated to reporting agency:

a. Federal Resources (other than CSBG)

- a. Weatherization (DOE) (include oil overcharge \$\$)
- b. LIHEAP- Fuel Assistance (HHS) (include oil overcharge \$\$)
- c. LIHEAP- Weatherization (HHS) (include oil overcharge \$\$)
- d. Head Start (HHS)
- e. Early Head Start (HHS)
- f. Older Americans Act (HHS)
- g. SSBG (HHS)
- h. Medicare/Medicaid (HHS)
- i. Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
- j. Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG)
- k. Other HHS resources (list largest to smallest):

TOTAL HHS Other:

- l. WIC (USDA)
- m. All USDA Non-Food Programs (e.g. rural development)
- n. All Other USDA Food Programs
- o. CDBG - Federal, State, and Local
- p. Housing Programs (HUD):
 - i. Section 8
 - ii. Section 202
 - iii. Home Tenant Based Assistance
 - iv. HOPE for Homeowners Program (H4H)
 - v. Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP)
 - vi. Continuum of Care (CofC)
- q. All other HUD including homeless programs
- r. Employment and training programs (US DOL)
- s. Other US DOL programs
- t. Corp. for National and Community Services (CNCS)
- u. FEMA
- v. Transportation (US DOT)
- w. Department of Education
- x. Department of Justice
- y. Department of Treasury
- z. Other Federal Sources (list largest to smallest):

TOTAL Federal Other:

ARRA ONLY

2.	\$57,788,732	\$83,176,763
a.	\$3,986,933	\$32,717,200
b.	\$36,605,838	\$0
c.	\$41,053,908	\$107,957
d.	\$177,373,292	\$6,966,978
e.	\$17,867,370	\$12,523,221
f.	\$6,072,284	\$189,307
g.	\$327,205	\$0
h.	\$15,590,229	\$617,339
i.	\$431,774,239	\$91,807,015
j.	\$16,843,833	\$189,324
i.	\$7,579,798	\$1,132,758
ii.	\$2,815,032	\$230,745
iii.	\$305,826	\$0
iv.	\$0	\$0
k.	\$10,700,656	\$1,363,503
l.	\$31,685,185	\$31,118
m.	\$2,482,298	\$158,642
n.	\$201,521,234	\$3,552,210
o.	\$24,543,407	\$578,337
i.	\$11,050,211	\$80,977
ii.	\$0	\$0
iii.	\$0	\$0
iv.	\$0	\$0
v.	\$927,238	\$217,418
vi.	\$760,366	\$0
q.	\$6,497,659	\$8,392,984
r.	\$61,747,828	\$7,647,161
s.	\$5,753,013	\$1,049,581
t.	\$2,416,447	\$429,398
u.	\$1,367,277	\$7,271
v.	\$587,500	\$0
w.	\$24,568,656	\$167,292
x.	\$1,277,344	\$96,383
y.	\$402,026	\$223,776
i.	\$4,653,014	\$123,674
ii.	\$836,821	\$9,323
iii.	\$1,112,111	\$378,807
iv.	\$12,053	\$0
z.	\$6,613,999	\$511,804

TOTAL: NON-CSBG FEDERAL RESOURCES

\$1,142,397,475

\$169,626,196

Number of Agencies Reporting: 61

Subsection II. State Resources

a. State appropriated funds used for the same purpose as Federal CSBG funds	a.	\$0
b. State Housing and Homeless programs (include housing tax credits)	b.	\$2,097,425
c. State Nutrition programs	c.	\$131,852,756
d. State Day Care and Early Childhood programs	d.	\$63,317,033
e. State Energy programs	e.	\$7,615,888
f. State Health programs	f.	\$9,129,371
g. State Youth Development programs	g.	\$765,858
h. State Employment and Training programs	h.	\$7,133,723
i. State Head Start programs	i.	\$928,155
j. State Senior programs	j.	\$352,374
k. State Transportation programs	k.	\$494,957
l. State Education programs	l.	\$6,937,696
m. State Community, Rural and Economic Development programs	m.	\$215,183
n. State Family Development programs	n.	\$1,731,788
o. Other State Resources		
	i.	\$6,598,260
	ii.	\$3,035,660
	iii.	\$316,857
	iv.	\$27,000
Total Other State Resources	o.	\$9,977,777

TOTAL: STATE RESOURCES

\$242,549,984

If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I
(Federal Resources), please estimate the amount

\$2,301,671

Section G

Client Characteristics

Statewide Aggregated Data

Number of Agencies Reporting: 58

2a. Total Non CSBG resources Reported in Section F TOTAL

2b. Total amount of CSBG Funds allocated

Total Resources for FY 2010 (2a + 2b)

\$57,788,732

ARRA ONLY
\$169,626,196
\$83,176,763
\$252,802,959

3. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom one or more characteristics were obtained

4. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom no characteristics were obtained

5. Total unduplicated number of families about whom one or more characteristics were obtained

6. Total unduplicated number of families about whom no characteristics were obtained

3.	1,365,109
4.	2,197,680
5.	604,609
6.	220,546

7. Gender

a. Male

b. Female

TOTAL*

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

611,661
685,831
1,297,492

8. Age

a. 0-5

b. 6-11

c. 12-17

d. 18-23

e. 24-44

f. 45-54

g. 55-69

h. 70+

TOTAL*

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

218,861
102,815
116,338
119,692
280,175
143,985
107,161
82,169
1,171,196

9. Ethnicity/Race

I. Ethnicity

a. Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin

b. Not Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin

I. TOTAL*

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

621,091
530,098
1,151,189

II. Race

a. White

b. Black or African American

c. American Indian and Alaska Native

d. Asian

e. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander

f. Other

g. Multi-race (any 2 or more of the above)

II. TOTAL*

540,215
124,513
29,111
72,389
8,709
192,869
69,793
1,037,599

10. Education Levels of Adults #

(# For Adults 24 Years Or Older Only)

a. 0-8

b. 9-12/Non-Graduates

c. High School Graduate/GED

d. 12+ Some Post Secondary

e. 2 or 4 yr College Graduates

TOTAL**

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

72,625
113,447
176,092
66,473
25,002
453,639

11. Other Characteristics

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

Yes No Total

a. Health Insurance

b. Disabled

279,907	195,455	475,362
99,676	535,417	635,093

Family Type

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

a. Single Parent/Female

b. Single Parent/Male

c. Two Parent Household

101,949
21,548
147,670

d. Single Person

e. Two Adults/No children

f. Other

146,150
38,185
52,049

TOTAL***

13. Family Size

a. One

b. Two

c. Three

d. Four

e. Five

f. Six

g. Seven

h. Eight or more

TOTAL***

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

158,246
91,760
86,857
85,241
60,658
37,966
18,378
15,771
554,877

14. Source of Family Income

NUMBER OF FAMILIES

a. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting One or More Sources of Income***

b. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting Zero Income***

TOTAL (a. and b.)***

c. TANF

d. SSI

e. Social Security

f. Pension

g. General Assistance

h. Unemployment Insurance

i. Employment + Other Sources

j. Employment Only

k. Other

TOTAL (c. through k.)

383,490

76,989

460,479

74,697

75,021

59,561

9,295

37,638

44,663

25,697

70,740

49,478

446,790

15. Level of Family Income (% of HHS Guideline)

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

a. Up to 50%

b. 51% to 75%

c. 76% to 100%

d. 101% to 125%

e. 126% to 150%

f. 151% to 175%

g. 176% to 200%

h. 201% and over

TOTAL***

144,804

88,356

74,358

36,531

36,708

34,539

3,202

2,539

421,037

16. Housing

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

a. Own

b. Rent

c. Homeless

d. Other

TOTAL***

66,932

281,279

43,613

47,624

439,448

Part II

Outcome of Efforts National Performance Indicators

Number of Agencies Reporting: 50

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in Community Action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed, as measured by one or more of the following:

- A. Unemployed and obtained a job
- B. Employed and maintained a job for at least 90 days
- C. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income and/or benefits
- D. Achieve "living wage" employment and/or benefits

Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
44,055	24,556	23,842	97.09%
20,752	12,080	11,912	98.61%
12,629	10,232	9,861	96.37%
13,383	9,541	9,325	97.74%

Number of Agencies Reporting: 54

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from Community Action, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained skills/competencies required for employment	36,904	24,778
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diplom	16,878	5,029
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma	3,657	2,450
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs	15,432	14,569
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant	32,163	25,126
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	17,853	9,172
G. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family membe	38,940	31,645
H. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	15,586	7,643
I. Obtained food assistance	69,375	63,557
J. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	75,104	75,079
K. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	36,309	36,306
L. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)	14,774	14,774

Number of Agencies Reporting: 47

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of Community Action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who qualified for any type of Federal or State tax credit and the expected aggregated dollar amount of credits

Enhancement 2. Number and percent of participants who obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments

Enhancement 3. Number and percent of participants who were enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings

Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits, or Savings) (\$)
48,976	39,207	101.39%	\$46,369,715
365	256	83.98%	\$373,459
97,482	79,959	116.82%	\$27,397,038

Number of Agencies Reporting: 47

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits, or Savings) (\$)
Utilization 1. Number and percent of participants demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days	7,578	4,477	4,270	95.38%	
Utilization 2. Number and percent of participants opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account	11,073	10,945	10,302	94.13%	
Utilization 3. Number and percent of participants who increased their savings through IDA or other savings accounts and the aggregated amount of savings	11,515	11,006	10,980	99.76%	\$766,105
Utilization 4. Of participants in a Community Action assets development program (IDA and others):					
Utilization 4a. Number and percent of participants capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings	425	315	322	102.22%	\$493,655
Utilization 4b. Number and percent of participants pursuing post secondary education with accumulated savings	687	589	556	94.40%	\$877,076
Utilization 4c. Number and percent of participants purchasing a home with accumulated savings	502	256	226	88.28%	\$2,607,826
Utilization 4d. Number and percent of participants purchasing other assets with accumulated savings	131	99	87	87.88%	\$5,374

Number of Agencies Reporting: 48

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Improvement and Revitalization

Increase in, or safeguarding of, threatened opportunities and community resources or services for low-income people in the community as a result of Community Action projects/initiatives or advocacy with other public and private agencies, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Projects or Initiatives (#)	Number of Opportunities and/or Community Resources Preserved or Increased (#)
A. Jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	985	11,595
B. Accessible "living wage" jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	686	8,212
C. Safe and affordable housing units created in the community	8,862	10,842
D. Safe and affordable housing units in the community preserved or improved through construction, weatherization or rehabilitation achieved by Community Action activity or advocacy	9,778	68,047
E. Accessible safe and affordable health care services/facilities for low-income people created, or saved from reduction or elimination	5,493	6,682
F. Accessible safe and affordable child care or child development placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	176	18,724
G. Accessible before-school and after-school program placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	580	21,977
H. Accessible new or expanded transportation resources, or those that are saved from reduction or elimination, that are available to low-income people, including public or private transportation	713	3,608
I. Accessible or increased educational and training placement opportunities, or those that are saved from reduction or elimination, that are available for low-income people in the community, including vocational, literacy, and life skill training, ABE/GED, and post secondary education	2,405	10,038

Number of Agencies Reporting: 40

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Quality of Life and Assets	Number of Program Initiatives or Advocacy Efforts (#)	Number of Community Assets, Services, or Facilities Preserved or Increased (#)
The quality of life and assets in low-income neighborhoods are improved by Community Action initiative or advocacy, as measured by one or more of the following:		
A. Increases in community assets as a result of a change in law, regulation or policy, which results in improvements in quality of life and assets	39	86
B. Increase in the availability or preservation of community facilities	124	56,945
C. Increase in the availability or preservation of community services to improve public health and safety	368	115,584
D. Increase in the availability or preservation of commercial services within low-income neighborhoods	44	18,861
E. Increase in or preservation of neighborhood quality-of-life resources	381	54,736

Number of Agencies Reporting: 50

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Engagement

The number of community members working with Community Action to improve conditions in the community.

**Total
Contribution
by
Community (#)**

A. Number of community members mobilized by Community Action that participate in community revitalization and anti-poverty initiatives

78,179

B. Number of volunteer hours donated to the agency
(This will be ALL volunteer hours)

2,725,327

Number of Agencies Reporting: 49

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Employment Growth from ARRA Funds

The total number of jobs created or saved, at least in part by ARRA funds, in the community.

**Number of
Jobs (#)**

A. Jobs created at least in part by ARRA funds

9,510

B. Jobs saved at least in part by ARRA funds

1,006

Number of Agencies Reporting: 46

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

Community Enhancement through Maximum Feasible Participation

	Total Number of Volunteer Hours (#)
Total number of volunteer hours donated by low-income individuals to Community Action (This is ONLY the number of volunteer hours from individuals who are low-income)	1,563,751

Number of Agencies Reporting: 52

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

Community Enhancement through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of Community Action initiatives to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community, as measured by one or more of the following:

**Number of
Low-Income
People (#)**

A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy-setting through Community Action efforts

3,824

B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of Community Action assistance

468

C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own home in their community as a result of Community Action assistance

192

D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by Community Action

118,428

Number of Agencies Reporting: 57

Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to
v-income people are achieved

Expanding Opportunities through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, that
Community Action actively works with to expand resources and
opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes,

	Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)
Non-Profit	4,421
Faith Based	1,947
Local Government	1,219
State Government	405
Federal Government	228
For-Profit Business or Corporation	1,788
Consortiums/Collaboration	989
Housing Consortiums/Collaboration	257
School Districts	537
Institutions of post secondary education/training	305
Financial/Banking Institutions	224
Health Service Institutions	405
State wide associations or collaborations	212

In the rows below, please include any additional indicators that were not captured above.

710

Total number of organizations CAAs work with to
promote family and community outcomes
(This total is not calculated automatically)

12,231

Number of Agencies Reporting: 42

Goal 5: Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results

Agency Development

The number of human capital resources available to Community Action that increase agency capacity to achieve family and community outcomes, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Resources in Agency (#)
Number of Certified-Community Action Professionals	29
Number of Nationally Certified ROMA Trainers	3
Number of Family Development Trainers	145
Number of Child Development Trainers	154
Number of Staff Attending Trainings	5,486
Number of Board Members Attending Trainings	528
Hours of Staff in Trainings	142,327
Hours of Board Members in Trainings	6,783

Number of Agencies Reporting: 47

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Independent Living

The number of vulnerable individuals receiving services from Community Action who maintain an independent living situation as a result of those services:

Number of
Vulnerable
Individuals
Living
Independently (#)

A. Senior Citizens (seniors can be reported twice, once under Senior Citizens and again if they are disabled under individuals with Disabilities, ages 55-over)

281,272

B. Individuals with Disabilities

0-17

9,101

18-54

21,485

55-over

30,369

Total (NOT automatically calculated)

70,592

Number of Agencies Reporting: 58

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Emergency Assistance

The number of low-income individuals served by Community Action who sought emergency assistance and the number of those individuals for whom assistance was provided, including such services as:

	Number of Individuals Seeking Assistance (#)	Number of Individuals Receiving Assistance (#)
A. Emergency Food	2,501,697	2,480,466
B. Emergency fuel or utility payments funded by LIHEAP or other public and private funding sources	203,075	187,523
C. Emergency Rent or Mortgage Assistance	25,248	17,114
D. Emergency Car or Home Repair (i.e. structural, appliance, heating system, etc.)	2,480	2,308
E. Emergency Temporary Shelter	56,909	54,113
F. Emergency Medical Care	15,163	9,679
G. Emergency Protection from Violence	5,384	5,039
Emergency Legal Assistance	18,592	18,134
I. Emergency Transportation	49,883	44,439
J. Emergency Disaster Relief	101,319	101,299
K. Emergency Clothing	64,952	60,165

Number of Agencies Reporting: 49

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Child and Family Development

The number and percentage of all infants, children, youth, parents, and other adults participating in developmental or enrichment programs who achieve program goals, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Infant and Child 1. Infants and children obtain age appropriate immunizations, medical, and dental care.	38,797	37,510	37,276	99.38%
Infant and Child 2. Infant and child health and physical development are improved as a result of adequate nutrition	204,993	201,493	202,707	100.60%
Infant and Child 3. Children participate in pre-school activities to develop school readiness skills	26,259	26,125	25,991	99.49%
Infant and Child 4. Children who participate in pre-school activities are developmentally ready to enter Kindergarten or 1st Grade	15,088	14,958	14,998	100.27%
Youth 1. Youth improve health and physical development	40,900	33,097	33,913	102.47%
Youth 2. Youth improve social/emotional development	23,695	19,196	19,763	102.95%
Youth 3. Youth avoid risk-taking behavior for a defined period of time	20,080	14,932	15,427	103.32%
Youth 4. Youth have reduced involvement with criminal justice system	15,879	10,040	10,170	101.29%
Youth 5. Youth increase academic, athletic, or social skills for school success	53,645	43,668	43,248	99.04%
Adult 1. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved parenting skills	26,480	19,998	19,671	98.36%
Adult 2. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved family functioning skills	26,573	20,160	19,519	96.82%

Number of Agencies Reporting: 36

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Family Supports (Seniors, Disabled, and Caregivers)

Low-income people who are unable to work, especially seniors, adults with disabilities, and caregivers, for whom barriers to family stability are reduced or eliminated, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Enrolled children in before or after school programs	2,265	1,975
B. Obtained care for child or other dependant	932	804
C. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	2,625	2,245
D. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family memb	8,890	8,939
E. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	5,822	4,386
F. Obtained food assistance	231,795	234,563
G. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	42,551	41,337
H. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	19,251	19,208
I. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)	14,475	14,475

Number of Agencies Reporting: 45

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Service Counts

The number of services provided to low-income individuals and/or families, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Services (#)
A. Food Boxes	1,735,806
B. Pounds of Food	48,462,677
C. Units of Clothing	280,802
D. Rides Provided	46,560
E. Information and Referral Calls	768,974